

COMMISSION CONFERENCE

APRIL 5, 2001

Agenda Item

Page

I-A	Community Services Board	1
I-B	Arts and Science Garage Revenues – Performing Arts Center Authority	6
I-C	Development of City-Owned Commercial Property – Sistrunk Boulevard and Northwest 7 th Avenue	8
I-D	Construction of One-Stop Shop at Lincoln Park Facility	13
III-B	Advisory Board Vacancies:	
	1. Budget Advisory Board (Deferred)	16
	2. Cemeteries Board of Trustees	16
	3. Community Appearance Board (Deferred)	16
	4. Community Services Board (Deferred)	16
	5. Education Advisory Board	17
	6. Insurance Advisory Board	17
	7. Marine Advisory Board	17
	8. Nuisance Abatement Board	17
	9. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board (Deferred)	18
IV	City Commission Reports:	
	1. Legislative Day	18
	2. Police Chief's Retirement	18
	3. Neighborhoods USA Conference	19
	4. Pioneer Women of Fort Lauderdale	19
	5. Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations Proposal	19
	6. Citizen Volunteer Corps	19
	7. Flooding	19
	8. Campaign Yard Signs	20
	9. Campaign Financing Reform	20
	10. Special Events on Las Olas Boulevard	20
	11. 13 th Street Project	20
	12. Bayview Elementary School	20
	13. Budget Advisory Board	21
	14. ULI Presentation	21
	15. Community Development	21
	16. League of Cities	21
	17. Beach Renourishment	21
	18. Cutting Trees	22
V	City Manager Reports:	
	1. Police Chief Selection	22

Present: Mayor Naugle
Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz, Moore and Smith

Also Present: City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk and Police Sergeant

I-A – Community Services Board

A joint meeting with the Community Services Board was scheduled to discuss Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding and other issues of mutual interest. The City Manager introduced Ms. Faye Outlaw, Assistant Director of Community & Economic Development, who presented a slide program. She stated that the Board oversaw CDBG spending, and a presentation was made each year with regard to the allocation. The last presentation had been on June 12, 2000, and last year's allocation had been \$2,679,000, and 20% was dedicated to administrative and operating costs.

Ms. Outlaw advised that there had been \$2,143,000 to distribute to projects last year, but requests for funding had exceeded \$6 million. She stated that some spending decisions had been made in May, 1999 under the serious threat of losing some \$3 million in unspent funds. Therefore, a number of policy initiatives had been developed and endorsed by the City Commission to speed up the process and avoid a recurrence of that situation.

Ms. Outlaw said those administrative initiatives had included:

- A 2-year "use it or lose it" provision on infrastructure and acquisition projects;
- Maintenance of CRA funding of \$1 million;
- Switching of acquisition to HOME funds from CDBG;
- A 1-year "use it or lose it" provision on EZ funds; and
- Limiting the source of funds non-profit organizations could "tap into".

On the basis of those policy initiatives, some difficult decisions had to be made about priorities. She noted that this had caused concerns on the part of the Board when activities had not been funded because of a history of slow spending in the past. Ms. Outlaw stated that some of the agencies had voiced their concerns to the Board, including the Mount Bethel Development and Empowerment organization working on an after-school program. She explained that the program had been slow "getting off the ground," and most of the money had still been "sitting on account." Therefore, the organization had not been considered in the proposed CDBG budget.

Ms. Outlaw stated that there had been a very emotional meeting at the Board level with regard to Mount Bethel, and staff had been able to reinstate that organization's funding to get it through the remainder of the year. Another issue had involved increasing the funding from \$100,000 to \$300,000, which the City had not been able to do. However, the childcare subsidy had been increased by \$50,000, and the expense of the development and empowerment organization.

Ms. Outlaw reported that the Board had also raised a number of concerns about CDBG funding based on the limited amount available. She stated that there was a contract for the United Residents Council that had not made it into the proposed budget because, under the new standards, the organization had money sitting on account. Ms. Outlaw explained that performance had been questionable at that point, and a corrective action plan had been developed. She believed this request for a workshop with the Commission had been the result of the Board meeting at which this had been discussed.

Ms. Outlaw stated that the situation would be similar next year. She explained that the allocation was projected at \$2,769,000, and \$2,215,200 was likely for distribution. Ms. Outlaw said the question was whether the Commission wanted to continue funding the existing priorities contained in this year's budget, a list of which had been distributed, or change the standards that had been set.

Mayor Naugle asked if this Board had received information about the Community Redevelopment Agency's (CRA's) request for CDBG funds. Ms. Outlaw replied that this Board had not been involved in the CRA. Mayor Naugle inquired about the amount involved, and Ms. Outlaw advised that \$1 million had been discussed. Mayor Naugle asked whom Ms. Outlaw reported to, and she replied that she reported to the Assistant City Manager, Mr. Pete Witschen. She also advised that the CRA Director reported to the City Manager.

Mayor Naugle thought it was unusual for the Commission to be asked to make a decision involving the CRA Advisory Board and CDBG funds, while this Board had no knowledge of it. He was also a little unprepared because the Commission usually did not receive large amounts of information at a Commission meeting, but before. Mayor Naugle hoped this Board would receive the information provided to the CRA Advisory Board.

The City Manager explained that the role of the CRA Advisory Board was to prepare a strategic, multi-year financing plan, which had been presented to the Commission last week. That plan had projected the use of several funding resources that, as he had mentioned, had not necessarily been reviewed or approved by other appropriate agencies.

At 2:16 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting. He returned at 2:20 P.M.

The City Manager said he had tried to emphasize the fact that there would be other recommendations presented to the Commission that might require some policy determinations, and CDBG had been specifically mentioned. Due to time constraints, the CRA Board had not had an opportunity to make a formal proposal to this Board.

Commissioner Katz suggested the \$1 million for the CRA be removed and the rest of the funding proposals sent back to the Community Services Board so it could provide suggestions the Commission would have time to study. Commissioner Hutchinson supported this idea. Mayor Naugle agreed and noted that there was a new public agency that would be providing some \$30 million for children's services in Broward County. He felt some of the requests for CDBG funding should be referred to that agency because about 20% of the \$30 million would be coming from Fort Lauderdale taxpayers.

The City Manager said this meeting had not been intended as a decision-making session, but as a workshop to obtain input from both the Board and the Commission so everyone would understand the Commission's funding priorities. At this time, staff wanted to make sure the Board was "on board" with the Commission's priorities, and he apologized if the back-up memorandum had not been very clear in this regard. Commissioner Moore noted that the Commission might wish to alter its priorities after hearing from the Board today.

Commissioner Smith asked if the Board had taken up the items point-by-point. Ms. Outlaw replied it had not. She explained that the information presented during the slide program was primarily the same information presented to the Commission about 2 years ago. Ms. Outlaw said she had provided it again briefly to put the issues into context and provide a framework for discussion. Commissioner Smith understood the priorities were those the Commission had established for this year. Ms. Outlaw agreed that was correct. She stated that staff was only seeking any changes in those priorities today, so a budget could be "work-shopped" through the Board process.

Mr. Dana Summers, Chairman of the Community Services Board, said he had been under the impression that this would be an informational meeting concerning social/cultural funding. Mayor Naugle agreed that had been his understanding as well, but the requests had already been presented so it would be difficult to stop the process at this point. Commissioner Moore recalled consensus that the Commission wanted to consider how social/cultural organizations would be funded, although there had been no indication that would be done this year. That was Commissioner Smith's recollection as well.

Commissioner Moore was sure the Board had heard the Commission had discussed the possibility of eliminating social/cultural funding, particularly in light of the new taxing entity to provide children's services in Broward County. Mayor Naugle did not think there was any harm in discussing that at this time, but he pointed out that this had not been advertised on the agenda for discussion today. Commissioner Smith recalled that the question had been whether or not it was appropriate to use tax dollars to fund charitable organizations that some citizens might not support.

Mr. Summers believed the Board felt social/cultural funding was worthwhile. From a personal perspective, he felt this was a prosperous community with an ever-growing tax base, and he saw no problem with distributing \$130,000 to a variety of local organizations. He recalled a survey indicating that 76% of City residents felt this spending was appropriate, so it appeared there was community consensus that the City should continue to donate money to various organizations. Mr. Summers thought the various organizations were appreciative of this funding, and the Board had discussed the idea of limiting funding to a 2-year period with organizations skipping one funding cycle before they could request funding again. As a 4-year member of the Board, he thought that was a good policy because the same organizations came back for funding year after year.

Mr. Summers thought one weakness in this process was that the City did not advertise the fact that these funds were available, so it was not widely known except by existing organizations that had been funded in the past. He believed the majority of the Board agreed that the same organizations should not be funded year after year. The Board generally agreed that start-up funds would be appropriate for a couple of years, allowing opportunities for new organizations to get off the ground.

Commissioner Smith asked the City Attorney if this was a policy matter or the subject of an ordinance. The City Attorney replied that only allowing a 2-year funding opportunity could be handled as a policy, although an ordinance would put such a policy more securely in place. Commissioner Hutchinson believed the Commission's policy was to allow a 3-year funding cycle followed by a skipped year. The City Manager noted that there were sometimes exceptions the Commission wished to make, and he recalled a couple of organizations the Commission had decided it wanted to continue to fund due to the populations they served and matching requirements that allowed leveraging for greater funds. Commissioner Smith agreed the Commission had decided it wanted to continue funding the Area Agency on Aging and the Childcare Connection (Family Central). Mr. Summers reported that the Board had also recommended that those organizations be permanently funded.

Mayor Naugle pointed out that the Childcare Connection could possibly be funded with the new children's services tax, and the City provided a very small amount. He thought that could free up some of the cultural/social funding for other worthy organizations.

Mr. Harvey Meltzer, Community Services Board member, noted that no one knew yet how much money would be forthcoming from the new children's services tax. Until that was known, he was hesitant not to fund other organizations providing childcare services. Mayor Naugle thought it an educated guess that funding would be forthcoming. Mayor Naugle thought it was an educated guess that funding would be forthcoming. Mr. Meltzer agreed, but there was no guarantee, so he did not want to base decisions on supposition.

Commissioner Smith recalled that the Commission had decided to continue the social/cultural funding this year using the same process used in the past, with the idea that discontinuing it would be considered in subsequent years. Mayor Naugle asked Commissioner Smith if he wanted to implement the 3-year funding limit this year. Commissioner Smith thought it was an issue that could be considered, but a list of those organizations affected was necessary first.

Ms. Marsha Goldsby, Board member, stated that staff had already provided the Board with the number of times the various organizations had been funded. She also believed the 3-year policy was in effect for this year. However, she had some personal concerns. For example, Ms. Goldsby desired some direction from the Commission with regard to CDBG funding initiatives. She had also been informed that the money from the children's services tax would not be available to anyone until November, 2002. Therefore, the Board had been more supportive of certain organizations.

Ms. Jennie Brooks, Board member, felt the availability of the social/cultural funding should be better advertised, particularly for new organizations. At present, she understood the organizations became aware of it only through word of mouth. Ms. Brooks acknowledged that some people did not feel their tax dollars should be used for charitable purposes, but she also felt they were probably unaware of the services these organizations provided.

Mayor Naugle recalled another idea the Commission had discussed had been to use the \$130,000 now being used to fund organizations to hire someone who could help those organizations obtain corporate assistance or grants. Commissioner Smith was also not averse to hearing from organizations that needed start-up money and could not find it from other sources.

Ms. Goldsby hoped the Commission would seriously consider maintaining the social/cultural funding, particularly since 76% of the community seemed supportive. She was also concerned that the Board members' home addresses had been distributed, and she had started to receive communications early in the process and considered it a form of lobbying that should be addressed. She also thought there should be an improved auditing process to ensure that the funded organizations were providing the programs for which the funds were intended. Mr. Meltzer agreed and felt start-up dollars were particularly important no matter how small the amount.

Ms. Marjorie Davis, Board member, thought it would be helpful if some of the Commissioners attended the Board meetings.

Mr. Bob Notti, Board member, felt there should be more new applicants for the social/cultural funding. He thought word had gone out that only certain organizations would be funded. Mayor Naugle asked how the funding was publicized. Mr. Terry Sharp, Assistant Director of Finance, stated that the information was posted at City Hall, and announcements were sent out to anyone expressing interest. In addition, whenever the Commission considered the subject, it was contained and advertised through the agendas.

Mayor Naugle recalled press releases in the past. Mr. Sharp stated that press releases were not typical in this case, although there had been press releases pertaining to the promotional grants. However, press releases could be prepared in this regard. Commissioner Smith suggested that announcements be sent to all non-profit organizations in the City. Mayor Naugle thought that could be done, but there was only \$130,000 available and numerous charitable organizations. Commissioner Moore suggested publication on the City's web page.

Mr. Sam Mitchell, Board member, recalled a request from the Navy League, which had wanted funding for transportation. Later, the organization had discovered it did not need the money for that purpose and wanted to use it for something else. It was his understanding that staff had approved a change in the use of those funds without additional input from the Board. The City Manager advised that he would look into that matter and provide a report.

Mayor Naugle expressed the Commission's appreciation to the Board for reviewing all of the funding applications, and he asked staff to place a CRA presentation on an upcoming Board agenda. Ms. Outlaw believed that could be placed on the May agenda.

Commissioner Moore agreed with Board members who felt there should be improvements in the auditing of the organizations that were funded to ensure that the promised services were being provided. The City Manager stated that staff could do that, but he explained he would have to analyze the relative benefit v. the cost. He advised that staff would provide the Commission with a full analysis and information about how audits were currently conducted. Commissioner Moore envisioned a cursory review. Commissioner Smith felt year-end reports on outcomes would be appropriate. Commissioner Moore agreed and thought any organization could provide such reports without tremendous effort or expense.

Commissioner Moore agreed that the Area Agency on Aging and Family Central should continue to be funded, but he saw no reason for the Community Services Board to consider those requests since the Commission had already decided on this issue as a policy matter. He also supported the idea of a 3-year funding cycle. Mayor Naugle wondered if the Commission could agree to discontinue funding for Family Central if children's services tax dollars were, in fact, forthcoming in 2002. Commissioner Smith felt that should be considered if and when those dollars were distributed.

Commissioner Moore believed that the availability of these dollars could be advertised at little or no expense through the various newsletters published in the community. Mr. Meltzer noted that Ms. Pat DuMont also had a web site on which this information could be disseminated.

Commissioner Smith understood the Board was aware that the Commission felt priority should be given to organizations that addressed the needs of the elderly and children. He also stated that these were also priorities in terms of CDBG funding.

Commissioner Katz said she had served as a member of the Community Services Board in the past, and she hoped the Board would consider the fact that there were often many organizations providing similar services. She also hoped the available dollars would be concentrated on the most viable organizations without duplication.

Action: Approved as discussed.

I-B – Arts and Science Garage Revenues – Performing Arts Center Authority

A discussion was scheduled on the proposed dedication of the City's share of the Arts and Science District Garage revenues to the Performing Arts Center Authority (PACA), as requested by Commissioner Katz. The City Manager said he had written a letter to the PACA not long ago to indicate that he would be recommending discontinuation of the allocation of a portion of parking revenues during the upcoming budget process. In response, the President of the PACA had written to each of the Commissioners urging reconsideration of that approach. Commissioner Katz had subsequently asked that the subject be placed on the Conference agenda, and he had sent a back-up memorandum to the Commission in this regard.

Commissioner Katz thought that performing arts centers throughout the country were extremely important to communities insofar as bringing in tourist dollars and promoting economic development. She believed the PACA had done a great deal to assist with the rejuvenation of 2nd Street, and she did not think it was appropriate to just "dump" them. Commissioner Katz understood the debt had been retired, but there were still capital costs, and she felt this issue should be reconsidered. She also understood staff had recommended an allocation of \$50,000, but that was not enough.

Mayor Naugle asked Commissioner Katz if she had a proposal. Commissioner Smith wondered if she had an alternative proposal. Commissioner Katz believed more than \$50,000 would be necessary.

Mr. Mark Nerenhausen, President of the PACA, wished the funding to continue at the same level, although the mechanism was an internal issue. He felt the larger issue was the relationship between the City and the PACA and a recognition of the benefits. Mr. Nerenhausen stressed that this was not funding for arts programming but the basic infrastructure necessary in association with the revitalization of the downtown area. He felt the mechanism provided the outcome the City desired – bringing people downtown, which helped with revitalization. Mr. Nerenhausen considered this mechanism an idea incentive program, and the question of whether or not there should be a cap on the revenues was a decision for the City Commission.

Mr. Nerenhausen stated that although the debt had been retired, there were millions of dollars in unfunded depreciation. Another key factor was that the City was a partner in the Performing Arts Center, and a quality performance base was essential. He noted that the other partners were continuing to provide support, and the Downtown Development Authority would be providing some streetscaping. Further, the County had contributed \$300,000 this year for capital replacement costs, and the School Board had contributed \$80,000. In addition, the private sector had stepped forward with a \$1 million endowment fund. Mr. Nerenhausen said it was crucial to maintain the PAC in order to retain the benefits provided to the community.

Commissioner Hutchinson noted that the City had been a partner in this from the first day, and she was in full agreement with Commissioner Katz that the City should remain a partner in this venture. She commended the PACA for retiring the debt earlier than anticipated, and she did not think the money should be taken away.

Commissioner Smith agreed the City should maintain its partnership, but he thought it was appropriate to reduce the funding now that the bonds had been paid off. He pointed out that there were other entities that would be looking to the City for assistance in the future. Commissioner Smith was not sure it would be appropriate to cut off the funding this year, but he felt a \$50,000 cap might be appropriate next year after the PACA had time to identify some new revenue sources. He was supportive of full funding this year with the understanding that there would be a cap in the following year.

Commissioner Moore felt there was a need for government subsidization in this case. He supported use of the parking revenue since it was an enterprise fund, and he felt it was appropriate to use parking revenues to fund other organizations such as the Historical Society. Commissioner Moore supported the \$150,000 contribution this year, and he thought the City could work with the PACA to help identify other funding sources to help the organization grow and prosper.

The City Manager understood and appreciated the history of the Performing Arts Center and its partners. However, the money was used for ongoing maintenance and capital needs, and he was not sure the Parking Fund was the correct source. Mayor Naugle felt it was an appropriate source because the revenues would not be generated by parking fees but for people attending programs at the Performing Arts Center. He asked if there were maintenance expenses associated with the garage that the City would have to pay. The City Manager understood that as the building aged, there would be infrastructure needs. He added that the Parking Fund was limited, and the City had to look toward improving its own parking situation in the future.

Mayor Naugle understood that bids would be sought in the fall for major repairs and recapitalization involving the City Hall parking garage and the Arts & Science District garage. He noted that the City's contribution would exceed \$1 million. Mr. Bruce Larkin, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the \$1 million figure was expected to be the Parking Fund's contribution to repair and renew all 3 garages. He noted that the major portion of the money would be used to refurbish the City Park Mall garage. Mr. Larkin explained that the Parking Fund was looked to for maintenance of parking facilities throughout the City and address future parking and transit needs.

Mr. Larkin noted that the City had a 16% ownership in the Arts & Sciences garage, so staff had been looking to pay for 16% of the repairs, with the PACA and the DDA funding 42% each, reflecting their shares in the ownership. He wondered if this contribution could be redirected to deal with that issue. Mayor Naugle felt that at least the portion attributed to that garage should be returned to it.

Commissioner Moore thought the only appropriate funding source was the Parking Fund because the entity itself was generating the parking revenues. He felt the PACA should receive the amount generated up to \$150,000, and he thought any overage could be used to promote the well being of that area. It was the consensus of the Commission to continue the funding from the Parking Fund. Mr. Nerenhauser hoped everyone understood the PACA received the net profit amount from the Parking Fund as opposed to the gross amount.

Action: As discussed.

I-C – Development of City-Owned Commercial Property – Sistrunk Boulevard and Northwest 7th Avenue

A discussion was scheduled on the proposed City-owned property located on Sistrunk Boulevard and Northwest 7th Avenue. The City Manager advised that the Community Redevelopment Advisory (CRA) Board had discussed this subject late yesterday at the request of the City Commission, and all but 1 member had voted for Option 3. He added that representatives of Milton Jones Development, the community, and staff had been present at that meeting.

The City Manager explained that the Board had considered whether the City should seek new proposals for the subject property or to provide the development rights to Mr. Jones based on the 1991 Request for Proposals (RFP), to which his company had provided the only response. He stated that the Board had voted to enter into negotiations with Mr. Jones, with specific development goals and a timetable set forth in the negotiated development agreement to be approved by the CRA Board and the City Commission. The City Manager added that one member, Mr. Kevin Buckley, had voted for a 30-day test notice to determine if there was any interest in the parcel. Commissioner Smith understood 1 of the other members had a conflict. The City Manager believed 1 member had been absent, and another had abstained due to a conflict of interest.

The City Manager wished to note that because the CRA Board had met yesterday in a workshop session, this had not necessarily been a formal vote, but the consensus of those members who had been present.

Commissioner Smith understood there was a concern about whether or not the City could enter negotiations with Mr. Jones. Ms. Kim Jackson, CRA Director, stated that the parcels were currently in the name of the City, and the way to proceed now would be to transfer the parcel to the CRA. However, she believed negotiations with Mr. Jones could proceed. The City Attorney stated that if the parcel was transferred to the CRA, it would fall under Chapter 163 and require some additional legal steps and requirements. However, he believed the City could proceed with negotiations in order to streamline the process. Ms. Jackson agreed that all disposition of property in the name of the CRA still had to go through the public notice process.

Commissioner Smith inquired about the benefits of putting the property into the name of the CRA. Ms. Jackson replied that depending upon the kind of development, the CRA could be a tool, but it might not be necessary at all. Commissioner Smith thought rent subsidies from the CRA budget might be an example of a tool.

Mr. Sean Jones, Vice-President of Milton Jones Development Corporation, introduced *Mr. Milton Jones* and *Mr. Marvin Sanders*, of the Sanders Planning Group. He stated that a preliminary site plan was available that took into consideration the removal of the old Post Office parcel.

Mr. Sanders introduced the Project Manager and displayed the plat of the land dated 1991. He pointed out the post office site and advised there was only 40,000 square feet of land left. Therefore, if a large grocery store was placed on the site, for example, it would use almost all of the space, and the rest of the site would be under utilized. He displayed an aerial photograph of the area and pointed out the area in question. Mr. Sanders stated that the intent was to create a comprehensive block with more pedestrian access and a more secure environment.

Mr. Sanders said that a development similar to Regal Trace was contemplated, and he displayed a conceptual sketch. He described some of the features of the proposed project, including a food store, retail uses, and condominiums or townhomes. The abandonment of 5th Court was proposed in order to provide additional parking and service to the rear of a food store with a cul-de-sac. He noted that there were various utility issues to be considered, along with a modified turn lane and some open space to create a more secure and pleasing environment.

Mayor Naugle noted that this conceptual plan was presented for informational purposes only, and no decisions in that regard would be made today. Mr. Sanders agreed nothing had yet been submitted for DRC review.

Commissioner Smith assumed the idea was for the City to donate the land and provide a certain amount of time for development of a project concept for approval. The City Manager stated that the original proposal had involved the City providing the land without any consideration, and he believed those were the terms and conditions under which the RFP had been released. Commissioner Smith felt this was the way to go, although he thought there should be a specified time period determined for performance. Mayor Naugle believed a timetable could be established through the negotiations, DRC review, and financing.

Ms. Marsha Goldsby felt a grocery store would be wonderful for this area and wondered if any particular store was interested. Mr. Jones stated that no particular grocer had been contacted. However, once a contract was negotiated, the developer would pursue all grocers to determine interest.

Ms. Luisa Dowdy said she was the Elderly Representative for the Governor's Revitalization Council, and the neighborhood had waited for this for a long time. She stated that her seniors were paying \$12 to \$14 per month to cash their checks, and that would no longer be necessary if a small grocery store came to the neighborhood. *Ms. Dowdy* said that a grocery store was very much needed in the area, and she hoped the Commission would go forward.

Ms. Evelyn Lewis agreed that the citizens of this area had been waiting for a very long time to see this property developed.

Ms. Jennie Brooks understood proposals had originally been sought in 1991, and *Mr. Jones* had been the only party to show any interest. However, she thought someone else might be interested in the property now.

Ms. Deborah Frederick, of the Dorsey Riverbend neighborhood, thought it was interesting that the comments in support of this development were from residents while comments not supportive of Milton Jones Development had come from those who did not live in the area and would not be affected. She thought it was in the best interests of the City to support the viewpoints of those who lived in the affected area.

Mr. Gino Jamison, member of the church at 441 Northwest 7th Avenue, pointed out that *Mr. Jones* had a proven track record. He said he would hate to delay this in order to seek more proposals.

Commissioner Moore was annoyed with the way this item had been handled because the Mayor usually asked the District Commissioner for an opinion first, which had not been the case today. He complimented the Jones Development Company on its Regal Trace project and the operation of the Shops of Dillard.

At 3:57 P.M., Mayor Naugle left the meeting. He returned at 4:00 P.M.

Commissioner Moore did not believe the same things that had been "on the table" in 1991 were the same as the issues on the table today. He pointed out that the CRA Board had decided to put \$45 million on the table for commercial development. Commissioner Moore asked *Ms. Jackson* if this particular site would have the opportunity to use those monies. *Ms. Jackson* replied it would. She explained that the use of the money would be spread out to fund the entire plan regardless of who developed this project. Commissioner Moore asked if the development company could avail itself of CRA dollars to assist in this development. *Ms. Jackson* replied that it would be difficult to take dollars generated by this particular project for this particular project without affecting the finance plan.

Commissioner Moore thanked the community for the communications he had received in this regard, and he asked *Mr. Jones* how long it would take to get a food store committed. *Mr. Milton Jones* replied that it would take at least a year. He said it would be an arduous task, but he was hopeful a contract could be arranged with a food store. Mayor Naugle thought that was an ambitious schedule. *Mr. Jones* agreed it had taken 2 years to get Walgreen's for the Shops at Dillard. He acknowledged that this took time, and he hoped the City would allow sufficient time to attract a store of some repute to this particular site.

Commissioner Moore wanted the community to understand that it would take a long time to see a grocery store developed even if new proposals were not sought.

At 4:03 P.M., Commissioner Smith left the meeting.

Mr. Jones said he could not state exactly how long it would take to get a contract with a grocery store. He explained that development was a process, and there was nothing he could do to change that, although he would set about it as quickly as possible. Commissioner Moore explained his point was that even if new proposals were sought from other interested parties, the process would not be slowed.

Mr. Sean Jones believed bringing in major tenants related more to the history of an area than the RFP process. He was unaware of any new commercial, retail development in the northwest in his lifetime. Mr. Jones felt that was the hurdle as opposed to the RFP process because anyone offering proposals would not have control of the land at that point and could not pursue a major tenant until they did. He thought this project was important to the community because it would demonstrate that commercial retail development could be successful in this area.

Commissioner Moore felt others should be given an opportunity to offer proposals for this property so the community could obtain opinions from others about the kinds of development that might be possible in order to enhance the tax base in the area. He agreed that Mr. Jones had a quality company, but some people seemed to think that a grocery was a "given" if the project was awarded to Mr. Jones today. Commissioner Moore wanted to heighten the chances of a grocery store moving into the community, although he acknowledged the contribution made with the Regal Trace development that probably deserved some extra points in an RFP process. However, he thought the City should take advantage of the opportunity to hear from any other interested parties.

Commissioner Moore asked what negative impact there would be if Option 2 was selected. Mr. Jones replied that he had already responded to an RFP and displayed a preliminary site plan, absent the post office. Therefore, his company would be at a disadvantage if additional proposals for the same property were sought. He stated that his firm had relied on the City's promise.

Commissioner Katz felt the Milton Jones Development Company had paid its dues. No one else had been willing to put forth an RFP in 1991, but Mr. Jones had been willing to do so.

At 4:13 P.M., Commissioner Smith returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Katz believed Mr. Jones would have moved forward years ago, but the Commission had wanted to ensure that the residential development had been successfully completed first. She thought Mr. Jones should be given some time to proceed, and she was sure he would work with the community if there were any particular uses to which residents might object or specifically desired. Commissioner Katz believed it would take much longer if the City went through the RFP process again, and everyone knew Mr. Jones' track record. She felt the City should honor the commitment made 11 or 12 years ago and give Mr. Jones a chance to present some more specific plans, perhaps within 6 months.

Commissioner Moore wondered what time period the community envisioned in terms of entering into a development agreement with Mr. Jones. The City Commission stated that if the Commission approved negotiations with Mr. Jones, there was a 90-day schedule for execution of a contract. He noted that the development agreement could be as loose or as tight as the Commission desired, and timetables and all other details would be spelled out in the agreement.

Commissioner Moore wondered what staff would be looking for in the contract. The City Attorney replied that would depend on the Commission's direction. He assumed from the discussion that a timetable and establishment of thresholds would be desired. Commissioner Hutchinson said that she had read the minutes of the meeting held in this regard years ago, and the only reason the project had not gone forward then had been because Regal Trace had not yet been completed. Nevertheless, it appeared there was a presumption that when Regal Trace was completed, Mr. Jones would develop the property next door. She believed that had been the understanding at the time, and she acknowledged that it would take time to secure a grocery store for this site.

Commissioner Moore pointed out that a lot of things had happened in the last 10 years. For example, 14 extensions had been granted for completion of the Regal Trace development. Nevertheless, the project was successful, and the community wanted to see it happen again as quickly as possible. Commissioner Moore did not think entering into an agreement now was the way to do that, but he was willing to go along with the idea under certain conditions.

Commissioner Moore acknowledged that it would be difficult to bring in a grocery store, and he did not want the City to lose the property only to find residential uses replacing the idea of a grocery store. He wanted the agreement to contain the conditions necessary to ensure there would be a grocery store. It was agreed. Commissioner Moore also wanted to make sure this opportunity would benefit as many people as possible, and he wanted the agreement to ensure there was participation by others in the development of this property. He believed there had been a lack of that in the Regal Trace development, although he was sure there had been reasons.

Commissioner Moore also wanted to ensure community input, and Commissioner Smith was sure input would be taken during the process. The City Manager reiterated that there was a 90-day window for execution of a development contract. Commissioner Moore understood that, and the development agreement would provide a time period for presentation of a site plan, etc., and the most important public interaction would take place during the plan approval process afterwards.

Commissioner Moore said he had been trying to get a grocery chain to develop a store in this area for a number of years, and he had been told that the area lacked the necessary income levels to attract a grocery store. If this opportunity was going to be closed to any other interested parties, Commissioner Moore wanted it done with the understanding that there would be a food store on this property. Commissioner Smith agreed every effort should be made to land a food store, and there were a lot of different kinds of food stores. Commissioner Moore acknowledged that and, in fact, did not expect or even want a Publix store, for example. However, he did not want the City to lose control over the site unless there would be some food store.

Mr. Sean Jones thought it might be necessary to phase in other retail uses and housing to bring up the demographics in order to make the area attractive to a grocery retailer. He said the developer would do everything possible to bring in a grocery store, but all possible options needed to be available. Mr. Milton Jones pointed out that the property that would be most affected by development on this property was Regal Trace, and he certainly would not do anything that would not be in his own best interests at the very least. Commissioner Smith had faith in Mr. Jones, but if a project was not headed in the right direction, it would have to be indicated at some point.

Mayor Naugle suggested that the City Manager be asked to bring back a recommendation on the structure of the contract within 30 days or so to get additional Commission input to make sure it was what everyone had in mind. He noted that would allow a little more time to negotiate a contract as well. Commissioner Moore did not support that idea. He thought he was already hearing the “waffling” he was concerned about, and he agreed with Mr. Jones that the demographics in the area would probably have to be improved. He also felt the residential quality the Community Development Department had been working towards to stabilize single-family home ownership opportunities was the correct direction, but the community felt the greatest need was for a food store.

Mayor Naugle believed the City Manager could bring back a recommendation within 30 days. Commissioner Moore supported that idea with the understanding that a food store was the first and foremost issue, followed by additional participation in the development. Commissioner Smith wanted people to be able to “buy bread and milk,” but if the alternative was a vacant lot, he might be willing to consider other commercial uses.

Mrs. Lewis was sure everyone was better off because of progress in the past 8 years, and she thought everyone was viewing this property from a different perspective than it had been viewed in 1991. She believed that if the City requested proposals, there would be a lot of interest. Nevertheless, Mrs. Lewis wanted a developer who would listen to area residents and work to achieve their goals.

The City Attorney understood there was consensus to move forward, and a formal motion would be presented to approve negotiations and start the 90-day period for execution of a development agreement.

Action: Approved. Formal action to be taken at upcoming meeting.

I-D – Construction of One-Stop Shop at Lincoln Park Facility

A discussion was scheduled on a proposal to relocate the One-Stop Shop to the Lincoln Park facility. The City Manager recalled certain concerns in this regard. He explained that although the Lincoln Park facility was not in the best state of repair, there was \$250,000 committed with the idea of replacing the roof. In addition, the idea of appropriately positioning the One-Stop Shop along a redeveloping corridor would be synergistic and allow an opportunity to assemble property to seek future redevelopment while addressing space needs.

Mr. Pete Witschen, Assistant City Manager, stated that this issue involved the City Hall Annex property and the Lincoln Park facility. He noted that there were roof leaks at the Annex, and the cost was estimated at \$250,000. Further, the space did not work very well from a customer service perspective that would cost about \$50,000 to rectify. Staff hoped not to spend this \$300,000 if the One-Stop Shop could be relocated, and he pointed out the difficulties associated with retrofitting a building not designed for this purpose.

Mayor Naugle recalled the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the One-Stop Shop at the Annex, and he did not remember any complaints about having to retrofit a building not designed for the purpose. He believed \$1 million had been spent, and he found this very frustrating. Mr. Witschen understood his frustration and stated that the Annex property measured about 2.4 acres. He hoped to be able to open this property to redevelopment along with some property to the south for a total of 2.84 acres.

Mr. Witschen stated that the existing City uses in the Annex would have to be relocated before the properties could be assembled and proposals sought for some type of development. Commissioner Katz wondered what kind of development was contemplated. Mr. Witschen advised the market would have to be tested to determine what interest existed, but first the City uses had to be relocated. Commissioner Katz was concerned about investing money in the Lincoln Park facility without a long-range plan. Mr. Witschen stated that there had been discussion about expanding City Hall or building a new City Hall, along with some private development. He advised that a detailed analysis would have to be performed. Commissioner Smith asked if there was any reason the property could not be sold. Mr. Witschen was not aware of any.

Commissioner Moore agreed that if the property across the street was assembled, it could be sold or used for a new City Hall or other governmental use. Another possibility was a row of housing in the downtown area, although he doubted it would be very affordable. Commissioner Moore pointed out that in order to encourage redevelopment in a community, government often had to lead the way by assembling property, just as had been done on the beach.

Mr. Witschen noted that the One-Stop Shop was traditionally a high traffic use, and parking was difficult downtown. Mayor Naugle wondered what cities did not have their building departments in their downtown cores. Mr. Witschen said he could provide an inventory, but he only knew of one off hand, which was located on the west coast in Collier County.

Mr. Witschen explained that there would be 2.8 acres on the combined Andrews Avenue sites, and a conservative estimate of the worth was \$25 per square foot or \$2.8 million. He stated that potential build-out was about 750,000 square feet with an estimated taxable value of \$32 million, generating about \$96,000 in tax revenues. Commissioner Smith asked if the property was located within the CRA boundaries, and Mr. Witschen replied it was.

Mr. Witschen felt the One-Stop Shop could be used as a redevelopment tool in the right location, and a downtown location might not be ideal due to parking and traffic problems. He recalled that the Commission had asked staff to seek to establish a City presence along the Sistrunk corridor. Commissioner Smith believed the decentralization of city services was something that was occurring all over the country.

Mr. Witschen recalled that competitive bids had been sought for the renovation of the buildings on the Lincoln Park site, but only 1 bid had been received at a cost of \$70 per square foot. However, that was not economically feasible. Therefore, staff was suggesting construction of a new facility. Commissioner Smith wondered why there had only been 1 bidder. Mr. Pete Sheridan, City Engineer, said an RFP had been issued and advertised in accordance with all the usual procedures. He thought the size of the job and current market conditions had inhibited bidding. Commissioner Smith suspected there would be more bids if proposals were sought for a whole new building. Mr. Sheridan expected it would be more attractive to bidders.

Mr. Witschen estimated the City's current space needs at 22,000 square feet, and a concept was envisioned for a small area within the building to continue to accommodate the parks programming. He displayed a site plan of the area. Mayor Naugle understood the idea was to demolish the existing buildings. Mr. Witschen agreed that was the concept. Commissioner Smith asked why staff thought the park should be retained at the front. Mr. Witschen replied it was basically a cost issue, and staff believed a landscaped plaza would work well for the corridor. Commissioner Moore agreed a plaza concept was exactly what was needed in this area.

Mayor Naugle inquired about the total acreage, and the City Manager thought there were about 9 acres including the Plant. Mr. Witschen noted that would leave space for additional private development on the site. Commissioner Moore asked how many square feet there were in the current One-Stop Shop. Mr. Sheridan replied that it contained 16,000 square feet, but more space was needed. He noted that the parks element used about 2,000 square feet that should be retained. Commissioner Moore wondered if 22,000 square feet would be enough space for the One-Stop Shop.

Commissioner Katz was concerned that there did not seem to be an overall plan. Commissioner Smith suggested a workshop meeting. Mr. Witschen stated that there was not a plan now for the property across the street from City Hall, but that project would come back to the Commission in the Fall.

Mr. Witschen stated that the project budget was \$4.2 million, all-inclusive, and the time frame envisioned barring environmental issues was approximately 18 months. He advised that the plan was to borrow money from the Sunshine State Pool and repay it from revenues derived from resale of the Andrews Avenue land with the balance accruing to the CRA. Mr. Witschen noted that consensus of the Commission would be necessary first for the reuse of that land, and staff would present some plan for consideration.

Mayor Naugle was concerned that this might be a piecemeal approach since there were various City activities that needed more space. Commissioner Moore pointed out that things often worked in phases. Commissioner Katz had no objection to a phased plan, but it seemed now the idea was to do this and figure the rest out later. Commissioner Hutchinson felt the whole Lincoln Park site should be considered for development so the City would not have to rent space. She agreed with Commissioner Smith that there should be a workshop to consider all these issues.

Mayor Naugle asked when the City Manager would present a recommendation with regard to City Hall. The City Manager replied that would come later, but staff was seeking conceptual approval of the idea that the One-Stop Shop should be located at the Lincoln Park site. He noted that a public/private partnership for development of that whole site was only one possibility, and Mayor Naugle had mentioned the idea of building over the existing garage. The City Manager explained that there were many options that had to be considered from a strategic point of view.

Mayor Naugle understood Commissioner Katz wanted to see the "whole picture" before proceeding with one part. She agreed that was the case, and Commissioner Smith wanted to see a longer-range concept. The City Manager noted that it would be a much longer period of time before an overall strategic plan was approved. In the meantime, he felt staff should start making plans to relocate the One-Stop Shop. Commissioner Katz did not know how staff would determine all the details of the uses at Lincoln Park without knowing the overall plan.

The City Manager said he had not expanded his original recommendation to go beyond the One-Stop Shop at Lincoln Park at this time, with the exception of maintaining the existing parks component. Commissioner Katz pointed out that there were all sorts of options. Mayor Naugle noted that some companies were even cutting back on their office space and sending employees to work from their homes.

Commissioner Smith had no problem with making a commitment now to move the One-Stop Shop to Lincoln Park forever. He felt that would be a commitment to that area and fit the City's needs from an operational standpoint. Commissioner Smith did not think anything else could move forward until the decision had been made to demolish the "junky" building across the street.

Mr. Witschen noted that the first thing that would have to be done was a space needs study to identify exactly what was necessary in a new building. He expected it to include all the elements necessary for a comprehensive development One-Stop Shop. Once the needs had been identified, the issue would be brought back to the City Commission. Insofar as a strategic plan, there were a lot of issues to consider, not the least of which was the future location of the federal building. He advised that the timing worked out well for that discussion in the Fall, but that schedule could be accelerated.

Commissioner Moore agreed there would be numerous issues to contend with when it came to the overall plan for City Hall, but relocation of the One-Stop Shop to Lincoln Park would have a tremendously positive impact on operations and economic development. He saw no need to continue to discuss it now that there was a site, a need and a funding method. Commissioner Moore viewed that as the first phase of the overall plan. Commissioner Hutchinson was comfortable with that, and her only concern was that 22,000 square feet would not be enough space for the One-Stop Shop. She had toured the existing facility, and it seemed very small. She hoped that if something new was going to be built, it would be adequate for current and future needs.

The City Manager stated that schematics for the One-Stop Shop at Lincoln Park could be presented for consideration in July, and an overall study for City Hall space needs could be considered at a workshop in the Fall. Commissioner Katz felt an overall plan was needed before the Fall. The City Manager advised that staff would do its best to bring as much information as possible to the Commission before the August recess.

Action: Approved as discussed.

III-B – Advisory Board Vacancies

1. Budget Advisory Board

Action: Deferred.

2. Cemeteries Board of Trustees

Action: Deferred.

3. Community Appearance Board

Action: Deferred.

4. Community Services Board

Action: Deferred.

5. Education Advisory Board

The Commission wished to appoint/reappoint Ms. Tanner Demmery, Ms. Mary C. Fertig, Ms. Jeane M. Owen, Ms. Ellen Salerno, Ms. Betty Shelley, Mr. John P. Wilkes, Ms. Mary Cavaoli, Ms. Lu Deaner, Mr. Gil Borrero, Mr. Bruce Tyrrell, Ms. Deborah Brown Frederick, Ms. Michelle Curry-Goosby, and Ms. Pearl Maloney to the Education Advisory Board.

Action: Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

6. Insurance Advisory Board

Commissioner Hutchinson suggested the appointment of Mr. Joseph Cobo to the Insurance Advisory Board. It was agreed.

Action: Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

7. Marine Advisory Board

The Commission wished to reappoint Mr. Lee Marteeny, Mr. Barry Flanigan, Ms. Marge Anderson, Mr. Joe Hessmann, Mr. Robert Sadowski, Mr. Kelvin Haynes, Ms. Heather C. Keith, Mr. Bernard Gartner, Mr. Chris Fertig, and Dr. Geraldine Udell to the Marine Advisory Board. Commissioner Katz wanted to appoint Dr. Nancy Beaumont, and Commissioner Smith wished to appoint Mr. Roger McKee to the Board.

Action: Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

8. Nuisance Abatement Board

The Commission wanted to appoint/reappoint Ms. Helen Surovek, Mr. Stephen M. Kelley, Mr. Robert Bissonnette (Alternate), Ms. Rita Jackson, Mr. Stephen Goldenberg, Mr. Harry MacGrotty (Alternate), and Mr. Caldwell Cooper to the Nuisance Abatement Board.

Commissioner Smith said he opposed the reappointment of Mr. Goldenberg. He understood there was going to be a District Attorney's investigation into the Nuisance Abatement Board because the Chair had illegally kept people from attending its meetings. Commissioner Smith did not feel Mr. Goldenberg ran this Board as the Commission expected, and a citizen had lodged a complaint about being kept out of a meeting. Mayor Naugle understood from the City Attorney that had involved someone who had entered the meeting room mistakenly seeking another meeting.

Commissioner Moore had no problem with Mr. Goldenberg, but the Commission did not usually appoint someone if one of the Commissioners had strong feelings out of respect. Commissioner Katz thought it would be appropriate to await the outcome of the investigation before judging someone guilty.

The City Attorney stated that it was never appropriate to bar someone from attending an open meeting. However, he had listened to the tape of the meeting and interviewed the staff people who had been present. It was his understanding that people had been coming and going who were looking for another meeting, causing some noise. At that point, one or more members of the Board had suggested the door be closed, but no one believed the door had actually been closed. He did not believe there was any violation of the Sunshine Law.

Commissioner Katz thought the fact that the Board had reelected Mr. Goldenberg as Chairman said something, and she had received a call indicating that the Police Department supported his reappointment. The Police Chief stated that the Police Department staff who had worked with the Board had expressed support. Commissioner Katz said she would not support the reappointment if Commissioner Smith felt very strongly about it, but she felt Mr. Goldenberg should be reappointed.

Commissioner Smith said he had a problem when citizens he represented had to live with slum conditions, drugs, and prostitution, and they were not allowed to speak before the Board. He wanted to send a direction to the Board that it could not “shut down” people. Commissioner Moore said he had listened to the meetings and read the minutes, and it appeared Mr. Goldenberg was well versed in the parliamentary rules and procedures and ran an efficient committee. Commissioner Smith said he would withdraw his objection, but he hoped he had made his point.

Action: Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

9. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board

Action: Deferred.

IV – City Commission Reports

1. Legislative Day

Commissioner Moore felt Legislative Day had been very meaningful, particularly as it related to the “dog issue.” He felt the lobbyist was making the issue very clear and explaining that a Citywide ban on pit bulls was not the proposal. Commissioner Moore advised that billboards had also been discussed yesterday, and the State Legislature was considering a measure that would allow a period of time to amortize the cost of removed billboards.

Commissioner Moore said he had met with the Secretary about the Juvenile Detention Center, who was willing to hold the \$600,000 appropriation for an addition to the facility. In the meantime, an alternate site could be explored in order to facilitate redevelopment efforts in that area. Commissioner Moore hoped all the Commissioners would be able to participate in Legislative Day in the future.

Action: None.

2. Police Chief's Retirement

Commissioner Moore reported that the citizens were “teary eyed” over the fact that the Police Chief planned to retire. He was sorry to see Chief Brasfield go, but he was appreciative of the time he had spent in Fort Lauderdale as an exemplary Police Chief.

Action: None.

3. Neighborhoods USA Conference

Commissioner Hutchinson distributed written materials about the criteria for choosing representatives for the Neighborhoods USA Conference. She had already selected her representative – Mr. Michael Kasten, who was the new President of the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations.

Action: None.

4. Pioneer Women of Fort Lauderdale

Commissioner Hutchinson reported that she was the Chair for the Pioneer Women of Fort Lauderdale's 44th annual luncheon next Saturday and invited everyone to attend.

Action: None.

5. Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations Proposal

Commissioner Hutchinson reported that the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations would be hosting the Study Circles Group to form goals and objectives. She stated that there was some good leadership now, and she thought it would be a good tool for the City Commission. In fact, the new President was hoping to arrange a bus tour to encourage people to look at issues from a Citywide basis rather than being so parochial about their neighborhoods. Commissioner Smith thanked Commissioner Hutchinson for revitalization this group.

Action: None.

6. Citizen Volunteer Corps

Commissioner Smith thanked everyone for participating in the recent Citizen Volunteer Corps project. Mayor Naugle wanted to get a copy of a photograph taken of his daughter with a paintbrush. Commissioner Smith advised that a video was being produced, and he hoped that it would result in a League of Cities application for a great community project. Commissioner Moore agreed the CVC projects showed another side of the Fort Lauderdale community that could earn an All American City award.

Action: None.

7. Flooding

Commissioner Smith reported that he had received a letter from Bank Atlantic about flooding, and he asked staff to respond. Mayor Naugle felt there was a need to educate people in this regard. He explained that having standing water for a short time after a heavy rain was actually beneficial. He added that the City should also respond to the Bank's inquiry about street closures. Commissioner Smith noted that the Bank President wanted to address the Commission, so he should be advised that there was a forum for that at the Regular Meetings.

Action: As discussed.

8. Campaign Yard Signs

Commissioner Smith desired a drafted ordinance regulating campaign yard signs. He did not feel they should be erected any earlier than 30 days before an election, and they should be removed within a certain time period.

Action: Staff to follow-up.

9. Campaign Financing Reform

Commissioner Smith understood there were some proposals being considered by the Charter Revision Board with respect to campaign financing reform. He wanted the Commission to send a message to provide recommendations before the next campaign season. The City Attorney advised that the Board understood the importance of the task and were prepared to move forward.

Action: As discussed.

10. Special Events on Las Olas Boulevard

Commissioner Smith wanted to make sure someone was addressing the problem with special events on Las Olas Boulevard. Commissioner Hutchinson reported that she and Mr. Kisela were working on it. Mr. Kisela said he was working with the companies on Las Olas Boulevard to reduce the street closures from 9 per year to 6 per year. Commissioner Hutchinson said there had also been discussion about providing shuttles to the County garage for events. Mayor Naugle felt the closures should be limited at least until Sagamore Street was reopened. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that a commitment had been made to open Sagamore Street during events, no matter the effect on the construction project, starting in September. Commissioner Smith requested a Conference report in this regard.

Action: Report to be presented on April 17 or May 1, 2001.

11. 13th Street Project

Commissioner Smith wished to publicly commend Mr. Kisela on a job well done with the 13th Street project.

Action: None.

12. Bayview Elementary School

Commissioner Katz commended Mr. Vince Gizzi, of the Parks & Recreation Department, with regard to his efforts related to the Bayview Elementary School and George English Park project.

Action: None.

13. Budget Advisory Board

Commissioner Katz requested a joint meeting with the Budget Advisory Board at the beginning of an upcoming Conference meeting.

Action: Joint meeting to be scheduled.

14. ULI Presentation

Commissioner Katz reported that a ULI Presentation by the Planning Director of Miami Beach was scheduled for the workshop meeting slated for April 17, 2001. She thought that would also be a good time to consider language relating to developments of significant impact.

Action: Presentation to be made on April 17, 2001.

15. Community Development

Commissioner Moore wanted to publicly commend Community Development Department staff on their efforts to further the goals of the CRA. Commissioner Smith and Mayor Naugle agreed great progress was being made.

Action: None.

16. League of Cities

Mayor Naugle reported that growth management had been a topic of discussion at a recent League of Cities meeting in Tallahassee. One issue involved an arrangement for school concurrency in which the school boards, cities and counties would be put together. He explained that one concern was that developments would be disapproved, and he had been misquoted in the newspaper in this regard. Mayor Naugle stated that the paper implied that the League was against school concurrency, which was not the case. Rather, the cities wanted to be partners in the process.

Action: None.

17. Beach Renourishment

Mayor Naugle reported that there had been a meeting with Steve Geller about beach renourishment, and agreements with property owners needed to be executed. The City Manager stated that a walk-on item would be presented at the Regular Meeting tonight. Mayor Naugle understood residents had to grant easements at the rear of the properties in order for the City to receive funding. The City Manager advised he would provide a status report.

Action: Staff to provide status report. Walk-on item relating to beach renourishment to be presented at Regular Meeting.

18. Cutting Trees

Mayor Naugle inquired about the process involved when someone cut down a tree without a permit. Mr. Witschen advised that violators were taken before the Special Master, and remedies included replacement of a tree or donations to the Tree Canopy Fund. He agreed to investigate the incident Mayor Naugle related in the Rio Vista area. Mayor Naugle suggested triple fees for after-the-fact tree removal permits. Commissioners Moore and Hutchinson did not support that idea, and Commissioner Smith noted that certain trees could be removed without permits. Mayor Naugle requested a recommendation from staff in this regard.

Action: Staff to follow-up.

At 5:41 P.M., Commissioner Katz left the meeting.

V – City Manager Reports**1. Police Chief Selection**

The City Manager announced that a new Police Chief would be sought on a nationwide basis. He noted that there were also some very viable candidates within the Police Department, and should they rise to the top through the competitive process, it would validate their qualifications.

Action: None.

Meeting adjourned at 5:44 P.M.

NOTE: A MECHANICAL RECORDING HAS BEEN MADE OF THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS, OF WHICH THESE MINUTES ARE A PART, AND IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.